

## **REMARKS**

Claims 27-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-4, 6, 9, 10-13, 18, 22, and 24-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent Number 6,396,476 to Bradski et al. (hereinafter “Bradski”). Claims 5, 7, 8, 17, 19-21, 23, and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bradski in view of United States Patent Number 6,664,990 to Bates et al. (hereinafter “Bates”). Claims 14-16 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bradski in view of United States Patent Number 5,396,600 to Thompson et al. (hereinafter “Thompson”).

For the Examiner’s convenience and reference, Applicants’ remarks are presented in substantially the same order in which the corresponding issues were raised in the Office Action. Please note that the following remarks are not intended to be an exhaustive enumeration of the distinctions between any cited references and the claimed invention. Rather, the distinctions identified and discussed below are presented solely by way of example to illustrate some of the differences between the claimed invention and the cited references.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the telephone interview of September 19, 2006. As a result of the interview, Applicant has amended paragraph 25 of the specification to remove references to electronic signals as discussed. Applicant has also amended claims 1, 10, 24, 25, and 27 with the limitations discussed during the interview. The amendments are fully supported by the specification.

Applicant has also amended claims 3, 4, and 26 to depend from pending and/or

appropriate claims. Claims 2, 11, 15, 16, 28, and 29 are canceled.

Response to rejections of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Claims 27-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 28 and 29 are canceled. Applicant has amended paragraph 25 of the specification to remove the reference to computer readable code being “electronic signals.” Applicant submits that the amendment directs claims 27 and 30 to statutory subject matter.

Response to rejections of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Claims 1-4, 6, 9, 10-13, 18, 22, and 24-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bradski. Because claims 1, 10, 24, 25, and 27 are amended with limitations of claims 15, and 16, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bradski in view of Thompson.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 10, 24, 25, and 27 with the limitations of claims 2, 15, and 16 and the teachings of paragraph 34 of the specification. As amended, claims 1, 10, 24, 25, and 27 include the limitations “...the pointing device interface module further configured to inventory a buffered event quantity and a buffered event type for the buffered pointing device events; and a feedback module configured to provide feedback to the user, the feedback comprising the buffered event quantity and the buffered event type for the buffered pointing device events and the pointing device events passed to a receiving process...” Claim 1 as amended. See also claims 10, 24, 25, and 27 as amended.

As amended, the present invention claims inventorying a buffered event quantity and a buffered event type and providing the buffered event quantity and the buffered event type to a

user as feedback. In contrast, Bradski teaches synthesizing input events like mouse clicks from external events such as speech or a head nod. For example, the user speaks “move left” and the displayed field of view moves to the left for the feedback element. Bradski, col. 4, lines 12-20. Thompson discloses inventories hold parameters for transaction processing (TP) service calls. Thompson, col. 3, lines 6-8. The inventories are used to map random data entered by a user through a computer human interface into a linear order for a TP service call. Thompson, col. 3, lines 8-11. Neither Bradski nor Thompson teach inventorying a buffered event quantity and a buffered event type and providing the buffered event quantity and the buffered event type to a user as feedback. Applicant therefore submits that claims 1, 10, 24, 25, and 27 as amended are distinguished from Bradski and Thompson and are allowable.

Claims 2, 11, and 28 are canceled. Applicant submits that claims 3, 4, 6, 9, 12, 13, 18, 22, and 26 are allowable as depending from allowable claims.

Response to rejections of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 5, 7, 8, 17, 19-21, 23, and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bradski in view of Bates. Claims 14-16 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bradski in view of Thompson. Claims 15, 16, and 29 are canceled. Applicant submits that claims 5, 7, 8, 17, 19-21, 23, and 30 are allowable as depending from allowable claims.

As a result of the presented remarks, Applicants assert that independent claims 1, 3-10, 12-14, 17-27, and 30 are in condition for prompt allowance. Should additional information be required regarding the traversal of the rejections of the claims enumerated above, Examiner is

respectfully asked to notify Applicants of such need. If any impediments to the prompt allowance of the claims can be resolved by a telephone conversation, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian C. Kunzler/

Brian C. Kunzler  
Reg. No. 38,527  
Attorney for Applicant

Date: September 28, 2006  
8 East Broadway, Suite 600  
Salt Lake City, UT 84111  
Telephone (801) 994-4646  
Fax (801) 531-1929